

NOMADIZATION AND ISLAMIZATION IN ASIA MINOR

SPEROS VRYONIS, JR.

The following paper is substantially the same as that delivered at the Symposium on "The Decline of Byzantine Civilization in Asia Minor, Eleventh-Fifteenth Century," held at Dumbarton Oaks in May 1974.

List of terms:

<i>achi</i>	member of a mystical-artisanal organization in Seljuk Anatolia
<i>amir-i-hadjib</i>	chamberlain of the sultan's palace
<i>cadi</i>	muslim judge
<i>dhimmî</i>	member of a protected religious minority in Islam
<i>feredje</i>	veil
<i>ghazi</i>	Muslim warrior for the faith
<i>gulam</i>	young male slave, recruited from non-Muslims for military and governmental service in Islamic states
<i>jihad</i>	Muslim holy war
<i>okka</i>	a Turkish weight
<i>sema</i>	musical ceremony, of a mystical nature, performed by dervishes
<i>synoikismos</i>	the joining of scattered settlements into one city
<i>tariqa</i>	dervish order
<i>ulama</i>	Muslim religious official
<i>zawiyya</i>	dervish convent

ONE cannot discuss the decline of Byzantine civilization in Asia Minor without examining closely the two phenomena of nomadization and Islamization. In a sense, nomadization and Islamization were the consequences of the double nature of the Turkish conquests in Asia Minor, nomadic and sultanic. Although it is true that the sultans were ultimately of tribal origin and that the nomads were converted to Islam, the institutions of the sultan were basically Islamic whereas those of the Turkmens were nomadic. The nomadic and sultanic conquests and patterns of settlements operated in different fashions, and their immediate effects on Byzantine society were of a different nature. First, I shall attempt to examine the dynamics of nomadic expansion in a particular region of Asia Minor, then the mode of life of the nomads, and finally their impact upon Byzantine society. Inasmuch as other aspects of this Anatolian nomadism have received detailed treatment elsewhere, they will not be dealt with here.¹

Many of the invading tribes, as a result of a variety of factors, came to be fixed on the north, west, and south in the strongholds of the high mountainous perimeters of the Anatolian plateau. Their presence in these regions is imperfectly attested by a wide variety of sources, so that there can be no doubt about their presence and significance there. For the purposes of this paper, however, I shall concentrate on the nomads in western Asia Minor, where their activities are best documented. In addition, the sources, as we shall see, indicate that their concentration in this region was relatively dense. Finally, it was these groups which consummated the Turkish conquest of western Anatolia and successively gave rise to the world of the beyliks and the Ottoman state.

The peculiar geographical configuration within which the Turkmens settled played a vital role in the history of events from the eleventh to the fourteenth century. The broadest general extent of this crucial area reaches from the two vital urban centers of Asia Minor in this area, Ankara (elev. 851 m.) and Konya (elev. 1027 m.) in the east, to the Marmara, Aegean, and Mediterranean seas in the west. This area, of roughly 225,000–250,000 sq. km., consists of three definite regions. The easternmost part constitutes the western edge of the great Anatolian plateau whose elevation varies in the vicinity of 1000 m. The section immediately to the north, west, and south is made up of mountain ranges which attain altitudes of up to 2000 m. in the north, about 2500 m. near Bursa, and over 3000 m. in the southwest. The third region that concerns us here, comprising the most western, northern, and southwestern area, is that of the fertile, low-lying riverine lands. This maritime region consists of the rich alluvial plains of the Sangarius, Macestus (Susurlu), and Granicus (Kocabaş) rivers in the north, the Caicus (Bakır), Hermes (Gediz), Cayster (Küçük Menderes), and Maeander in the west, and the Indus (Dalaman), Xanthus (Koca), Cestrus (Aksu), and Eurymedon (Köprü) in the southwest. In strategic terms, the

¹ S. Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism in Asia Minor and the Process of Islamization from the Eleventh through the Fifteenth Century* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London, 1971), 184–94.

crucial area which controlled movement between the riverine and plateau regions was the intermediate mountainous zone, traversable along certain river valleys and key mountain passes. Further, movements of large groups were easier from the mountains westward than from the mountains eastward. The plateau, aside from being climatically inhospitable, was less hospitable in terms of pasturage and water than were the river valleys, and the mountains did not inhibit movement in the west. Thus the plateau was secure behind the outlying mountain ridges, whereas the maritime regions were easily accessible from the mountains via the river valleys.

I shall attempt to trace very broadly certain developments in this critical western region of Asia Minor from the reign of Alexius Comnenus in the eleventh century until the final conquests by Turkmen groups in the second half of the thirteenth and the early fourteenth centuries. The process affords us a glimpse of uncontrolled nomadism and its cultural significance, and a glimpse into the fate of Byzantine society.

By the time of the early years of his reign, Alexius I Comnenus was faced with the fact that Byzantine control had disappeared almost completely from Asia Minor, and that western Asia Minor had been occupied by various nomadic groups under their own chieftains. By chance, Anna Comnena gives an incomplete count of these chieftains and their domains.

Tzachas and his brother Yalvac controlled Smyrna, Clazomenai, Phocaea, Samos, Mitylene, and Chios. Tangripermes and Merak possessed Ephesus and the neighboring towns. Elchanes ruled Apollonias and Cyzicus, whereas Anna relates that Scaliarius and other chieftains had also carved out domains for themselves in these western parts. Thus the conquests, the temporary settlements, and the emergence of a number of independent Turkmen emirs in western Anatolia during the eleventh century are similar to those which occurred in this area during the later thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. When in 1097 the Crusades inflicted a succession of defeats on these Turks at Nicaea, Dorylaeum, Pisidian Antioch, and Iconium, Alexius sent military forces to reoccupy Smyrna, Ephesus, Sardes, Philadelphia, Laodiceia, Lampe, and Polybotus, so that in the year 1098 Alexius was able to go as far east as Philomelium. The Emperor, taking advantage of the Crusader victories, had been able to push the Turkmens back to a line running through Dorylaeum, Santabaris, Amorium, Cedrea, Polybotus, Philomelium, and southward to Attaleia. But this repulse of the nomads eastward had intensified their numbers in the mountainous zone between the plateau and the maritime districts. The combination of high mountains and dense Turkmen settlements henceforth provided Konya and Ankara (which soon returned to Turkish hands) with admirable security, and indeed even Philomelium could not be held by Alexius. Consequently, by the end of the reign of Alexius I, the rough boundary between Turk and Greek, Muslim and Christian, sedentary and nomad was fixed in this large mountainous area between the plateau and the coast which stretched from the Sangarius River in the north to Attaleia in the south.²

² *Ibid.*, 114–17.

John II Comnenus (1118–43) seems to have held the advantage in the struggle with the sultan of Iconium and with the Danishmendids around Castamon and Neocaesarea in the north, and was able to campaign in Cilicia and to go to Antioch in the south and east. He was also successful in his military expeditions against the nomads of the central mountainous zone. But if one looks very briefly at his actions it becomes clear that the nomads seemed to operate constantly, independently, and despite the weakness of the sultanate at Iconium. Indeed, they seem to have ignored the treaty of Alexius with the sultan and to have threatened the towns of the upper Maeander. In 1119 John had to retake the city of Laodiceia from its Turkish conqueror Alpcharas and his numerous retinue; he took the occasion to wall the city. In 1120 he retook the city of Sozopolis about 120 km. to the northeast of Laodiceia and was then forced to recover Hieracoryphites and a number of unnamed fortified places in the direction of Attaleia. At the northern end he cleared nomadic raiders from the Sangarius upon his return from Syrian Antioch, and because of this constant pressure he rebuilt the fortresses of Lopadium and Achyraous.³ Toward the end of his reign (1142) he turned his attention once more to the districts of Lycaonia, Lycia, and Pisidia, for the enemy was once more besieging Sozopolis, and other towns had fallen.⁴ Though John had attained successes in northern Asia Minor and Cilicia, it was only with great difficulty that he partially contained the nomads who now sorely pressed the cities of Phrygia, the upper Maeander, Pisidia, and Lycia. The fact that the Turkmens had taken Laodiceia 200 km. southwest of Polybotus (the eastern boundary under Alexius) indicates not only the constancy of the nomadic pressure but the fluidity of the boundaries in this mountainous zone. In addition, Attaleia appeared to be isolated by the imposition of nomadic groups in the mountains overlooking the city.

The long reign of Manuel Comnenus (1143–80) is crucial in the history of the nomadic push toward the river valleys. There can be no doubt that his grandiose foreign policy involving both Italy and northern Syria caused him to diffuse Byzantine resources and strengths, while it is possible that the number of Turkmens in the borders increased during the second half of the twelfth century.⁵ Like his father before him, Manuel early in his reign found it necessary to chase the nomads from the regions of Melangeia and to secure Bithynia.⁶ Soon after, in 1146, the raids of the Turkmens extended to Pithecas, Celbianon in the Cayster valley, Lydia, and to the cities of the Maeander and Phrygia, with the result that Manuel had to campaign to relieve them, marching as far as Philadelphia and Konya.⁷ The Second Crusaders (1147) received rough treatment from the Turkmens of Mamplanes near Melangeia, encountering them on both sides of the Maeander as they advanced to Laodiceia, and were

³ Nicetas Choniates, Bonn ed. (1835), 17, 19, 44.

⁴ Cinnamus, Bonn ed. (1836), 22; Nicetas Choniates, 49–50.

⁵ C. Cahen, "Selgukides et Allemands au temps de la troisième croisade," *WZKM*, 56 (1960), 21–31; Vryonis, *op. cit.*, 120ff.

⁶ Nicetas Choniates, 71.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 71–72.

defeated outside Attaleia.⁸ In 1158, while making his way to Cilicia, Manuel defeated Turkmens in Little Phrygia,⁹ and despite the peace treaty concluded with Kilidj Arslan in that year, on his return from Cilicia Manuel again campaigned against the nomads. Since on his return he had been attacked near Dorylaeum, in 1159 he appeared in the Tembris and Bathys valleys near Cotyaeum whence he drove the nomads and their flocks.¹⁰ In his campaign of 1160 he set out from Philadelphia to plunder the district of Sarapata Mylonos, the domain of the enemy Solymas and his followers. Upon Manuel's departure the Turks reentered the area, captured Philetas, and killed many of the inhabitants of Laodiceia.¹¹ Though Manuel and Kilidj Arslan concluded another treaty in 1161/62, when the sultan made his celebrated visit to Constantinople, the nomadic pressure continued unabated until the disastrous battle of Myriocephalum. They pushed into the Phrygian Pentapolis in search of pasture, into the region between Lampe and Graos Gala near Chonae, and into the plain of Panasium and Lacerium, and even succeeded in sacking the city of Laodiceia at the edge of this heavy nomadic settlement.

Manuel fortified the regions of Pergamum and Adramyttium to protect the inhabitants, drove the nomads out of Dorylaeum, and rebuilt that city and Choma-Soublaeum. His defeat at Myriocephalum in 1176 was in part the result of the incessant nomadic harrassments and attacks before, during, and after the battle. Soon after, Turkish raiders appeared in the Maeander valley where they sacked Tralles, Phrygia, Antioch, Louma, and Pentacheir.¹²

It is obvious that the reign of Manuel marks a major advance of the Turkmens toward the river valleys. In the north, the pressure which they exerted from Dorylaeum and Cotyaeum toward Bithynia and Mysia was constant. They raided as far west as the Caicus River (Bakır), while their encampments had already reached the headwaters of the Hermus River where only the strong Byzantine outpost of Philadelphia blocked any further westward settlement. For a distance of some 125 km. east and northeast of Philadelphia we have indications of dense nomadic groups during Manuel's reign: at Lacerium and Panasium, between Graos Gala and Lampe, and in the Pentapolis. After the battle of Myriocephalum they raided almost the length of the Maeander, and Attaleia in the south remained isolated. All of Pisidia, practically all of Phrygia, and substantial areas of Lycia were now occupied by Turkmens.

With the disintegration of the Empire, which followed the death of Manuel and continued until Theodore Lascaris in 1211 slew the Seljuk sultan Giyath al-Din in the Maeander valley, thus halting further losses, the sultan's forces and the nomads made the next great advance toward the west. For the next fifty years the boundary of Byzantium in this area lay west of a line extending through Sinope, Castamon, Cotyaeum, and Laodiceia to the Gulf of Macri or

⁸ F. Chalandon, *Jean II Comnène (1118-1143) et Manuel I Comnène (1143-1180)* (Paris, 1922), 285-86, 290 ff.

⁹ Cinnamus, 179-80; Nicetas Choniates, 134-35.

¹⁰ Cinnamus, 191.

¹¹ *Ibid.*, 196-98.

¹² Vryonis, *op. cit.*, 123-26.

Fethiye, Attaleia having finally fallen in 1207 so that Lycia was now in Turkmen territory.¹³

So long as Nicaea remained the focus of Byzantine political and economic life the final Turkmen push was halted. The transfer of this political and economic focus from Nicaea to Constantinople resulted in first the neglect and then the penalization of these Anatolian provinces at a time when the sultanate of Iconium was itself undergoing decline. This left the nomadic groups literally unopposed and without any effective centralized control. From 1261/62, when the Turco-Mongol armies had to suppress Turkmen disorders in the plain of the Dalaman River, until the great Turkmen upheavals connected with Baybars' invasion of Asia Minor, these western Udj or Turkmen borders slipped from Seljuk control, and the Turkmen groups began to conquer and settle in the remainder of the river valleys.¹⁴ Some two decades subsequent to Michael VIII Palaeologus' reconquest of Constantinople, these formerly prosperous riverine regions were defenseless and in a state of severe economic decline.¹⁵ Seven years after the Turkmen upheavals in the Dalaman plain, Michael Palaeologus sent an army under his brother John to contain the Turkmen threat. Once on the scene he had to concentrate on the Maeander valley as far as Tralles, and the Cayster, since Caria (the district south of the Maeander and north of the Dalaman) had been definitively conquered by the Turks. This indicates clearly that the Turkmens had occupied most of Caria, including the ports of Strobilus, Stadia, and Trachia, in a seven- or eight-year period.¹⁶ Nine years later (1278) Michael sent another expedition to the Maeander to halt further deterioration of the situation, but by this time Priene, Miletus, and Magedon had fallen, the Turks had occupied the Cayster valley to the north, and the Turkmen advance down the Maeander had already taken Antioch and Caria.¹⁷ Though it was rebuilt and recolonized, Tralles (Aydın), as well as Nysa (Sultanhisar), was the next conquest of Monteshe in 1282 as he approached the mouth of the Maeander River. In 1304 Ephesus fell, while Thyraia and Pyrgi fell to the north. The Turks had captured Pergamum by 1302, and by 1326, 1331, and 1337 respectively, the last Bithynian strongholds of Prusa, Nicaea, and Nicomedia had fallen. There arose eight major and a few smaller Turkmen principalities in the combined riverine and mountainous districts of western Asia Minor; these included the Ottomans, Germiyan, the two Hamids, Monteshe, Aydın, Saruhan, and Karası. Thus, we see the successive nomadic occupations over a period of two centuries of Phrygia, Pisidia, Lycia, Caria, Lydia, Ionia, Mysia, and Bithynia.¹⁸

It is noteworthy that throughout the long period of over two and one-half centuries, during which the Turkish conquests and settlements of western Asia

¹³ P. Wittek, *Das Fürstentum Montesche. Studie zur Geschichte Westkleinasiens im 13.-15. Jh.* (Amsterdam, 1967), 1; C. Cahen, *Pre-Ottoman Turkey* (London, 1968), 117-20.

¹⁴ Cahen, *ibid.*, 280ff.

¹⁵ Pachymeres, Bonn ed. (1835), I, 502-5; G. Arnakis, *Οι πρώτοι 'Οθωμανοί* (Athens, 1947), *passim*.

¹⁶ Pachymeres, I, 310-12.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 468.

¹⁸ Vryonis, *op. cit.*, 250-53, 138.

Minor transpired, the principal agents and initiators were the nomadic groups and their chieftains. The Seljuk sultans participated but occasionally and fitfully.

The Greek, Latin, Arabic, and Syriac sources conclude that this long mountainous zone was inhabited by significant numbers of Turks, that they were by and large nomadic, and that they gradually conquered Western Anatolia. They are variously referred to as *Turkomanioi*,¹⁹ νομάδες, ποιμνίται,²⁰ πολυθρέμμονες,²¹ and σκηνίτας²² by the Greek authors. The Latin chroniclers and observers called them *Bedewini* or *silvestres Turci*,²³ and the Arab and Syriac authors describe them as *Turkmens* of the *Udj*.²⁴ These authors leave no doubt as to what they understood by these terms. Cinnamus says of them: "As yet unpracticed in agricultural undertakings they drank milk and ate meat, like the Scythians, always dwelling in tents and scattered about the plain. . . ."²⁵ On his return to Constantinople from Syria, John Comnenus expelled the Turkish raiders from the Sangarius "...and herds of livestock of every kind,"²⁶ a sure indication that the marauding invaders were *Turkmens* who had brought their flocks with them. Nicetas Choniates remarks of Manuel: "Sometimes repulsing the Turks who were scattered about the Rhomaic boundaries like broad herds, he attacked those around the Pentapolis and having captured many human bodies and many animals...returned victorious."²⁷ Shortly thereafter he ordered Gudelius Tzykandeles and Michael Angelus to attack the Turks. "All those who, having great flocks, seek after grassy meadows and fall with all their race upon the borders of the Rhomaioi."²⁸

The Turks, whom the armies of Manuel attacked at Panasium and Lacerium, were tent dwellers,²⁹ and those around Charax are described as herdsman.³⁰ In some cases, even the names of the tribal leaders are recorded. For instance, when Manuel returned from Philomelium to the region where the Maeander River rises (near Choma-Soublaeum), he came upon a great encampment of Turkmen tents where the chieftain (γενναρχης) was a certain Rama. The *Turkmens*, who were pasturing their horses, were accustomed to raiding the neighboring Greeks for booty (there is a careful description of how they protect their animals during retreat and battle).³¹ Late in the twelfth century we hear of another Turkmen chief, *Arsanes* (*Arslan*?), who must have been the head of

¹⁹ Anna Comnena, *Alexiade*, ed. B. Leib (Paris, 1937-43), III, 169; Cinnamus, 208.

²⁰ Nicetas Choniates, 255.

²¹ Theodore Scutariotes, in K. Sathas, *Μεσαιωνική Βιβλιοθήκη ἐπιστολαί*, VII (Venice, 1894), 254.

²² W. Regel, *Fontes rerum byzantinorum*, II (Petropolis, 1917), 261.

²³ Ansbert, *Historia Peregrinorum*, ed. A. Chroust, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Kreuzzuges Kaiser Friedrichs I.*, MGH, *ScriptRerGerm*, N.S., V (Berlin, 1928), 155.

²⁴ Bar Hebraeus, *The Chronography of Gregory Abū'l Faraj the Son of Aaron, the Hebrew Physician Commonly Known as Bar Hebraeus, being the First Part of his Political History of the World*, trans. E. A. W. Budge, I (London, 1932), 360; Wittek, *op. cit.*, 2.

²⁵ Cinnamus, 9.

²⁶ Nicetas Choniates, 44.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 162.

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 163.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 254.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 255.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 60.

a large group of nomads in western Phrygia. The rebel Pseudo-Alexius was able to recruit several thousand followers from him and with them to conduct pillaging forays.³² Sometime later, Alexius III sent an army against the "herdsmen" of the emir Arsanes, undoubtedly the same chieftain.³³ The members of the Third Crusade encountered the nomadic groups, often with unpleasant consequences, when they fought their way through Phrygia to Iconium. Unlike the Greeks, who were more familiar with their neighbors and took them for granted, the Latins describe their nomadism much more clearly. One author says of them: "It is, however, the habit of the inhabitants in this land, who are called pastoral Turks or Bedouins, to be without houses and to live all the time in tents [and] to move from one pasturage to another with their flocks and herds."³⁴ Further, a Latin source remarks, "They have no cities, but live in the fields."³⁵

It is thus clear that one is dealing here with a nomadic invasion. The nomads have not yet settled in towns or taken up sedentary life as full-time agriculturists. Their livelihood comes from their flocks and from booty taken in Byzantine territory. They were, at least superficially, Muslims who were further motivated by the spirit of the Holy War against the Greek Christians. When the Arab traveler al-Harawi passed through these border regions in the second half of the twelfth century, he noted the existence of a shrine on the Byzantine-Turkish borders (near Afyon-Karahisar) which was reported to be the tomb of the Muslim martyr Abu Muhammad al-Battal, and at Amorium the tombs of those who fell there in the celebrated siege of the city in 838. These constitute fascinating testimony to the fact that the *ghazi-jihad* tradition was closely intertwined into the nomadic society of Phrygia.³⁶ Not only was there evidence of a nomadic invasion but also of an epic society in its heroic age, and it is from this milieu that the Turkish epics were shaped: the Battalname, the Danishmendname, and the Dusturname.

This point gains certain fullness if one considers the question of numbers. The mere fact that the nomads successfully pushed westward and eventually (independently of any sultanic authority) reached the sea indicates that the pressure of the nomads was in part due to their number. At the same time the sources, though vague and inexact, give definite indications of heavy Turkmen settlements which provided a resource for the conquest of the maritime regions, as they did also for Greek rebels who found them willing recruits for raiding expeditions.³⁷ Pseudo-Alexius recruited 8,000 of them in western Phrygia;³⁸ 2,000 were encamped around Dorylaeum in the reign of Manuel.³⁹ They were so numerous in the Maeander plain, with their families and livestock, in the

³² *Ibid.*, 551.

³³ *Ibid.*, 658.

³⁴ Ansbert, *Historia Peregrinorum*, 155.

³⁵ *Gesta Federici*, ed. O. Holden-Egger, MGH, *ScriptRerGerm* (Hannover, 1892), 87.

³⁶ Al Harawi, trans. J. Sourdcl-Thomine, *Guide des lieux de pèlerinage* (Damascus, 1957), 131.

³⁷ Cinnamus, 59-60; *Ibn el-Athiri chronicon quod perfectissimum inscribitur*, ed. C. J. Tornberg, XII (Uppsala, 1853), 113.

³⁸ Nicetas Choniates, 551.

³⁹ Cinnamus, 295.

late thirteenth century that they were compared to a deluge. Planudes calls them "a flood of barbarians."⁴⁰ At the time of Barbarossa's march, his chroniclers report that they numbered 100,000 in the regions from the upper Maeander eastward toward Konya.⁴¹ Michael the Syrian relates how, in groups of 5,000 to 10,000, they attacked Manuel's army en route to the battle of Myrioccephalum, and that some 50,000 of them pillaged his camp.⁴² An Arab source of the thirteenth century asserts that the districts of Laodiceia were inhabited by 200,000 Turkmens with their tents, and the river valley just below Chonae came to be known as Türkmenova.⁴³ The Arab geographer of the early fourteenth century, al-Umari, gives a great deal of specific information about the Turkmen beys and their principalities in western Asia Minor. Specifically, he lists the armies of these beys, which must have often, though not always, consisted of Turkmens. He gives a double set of figures from his two sources, Orian and Balaban. According to the former there were 152,000, and according to the latter 555,500, followers in the armies of these various beyliks. The real number was probably somewhere between these two extremes, for Orian omits figures for three of these principalities.⁴⁴ Though one cannot put complete confidence in such figures, they constitute yet one more testimony to the large number of nomads.

All these circumstances demonstrate further that we have been dealing not with a typical military conquest and occupation of western Asia Minor, but with an ethnic migration of nomadic peoples of substantial numerical proportions. Having established the fact that the conquest and settlement of much of western Asia Minor was, substantially, the accomplishment of nomads, one must next examine the character of such a conquest and its impact on Byzantine society.

The process itself is described in its essential details by the Georgian chronicle for northeast Asia Minor and the adjoining Georgian regions, and we may turn to this text momentarily. The process which it describes was not unique to the northeast, for we see it in the west and the south of Asia Minor as well, but inasmuch as it is the best example of the character and effect of nomadic conquest, it is of some advantage to consider it.

The emirs spread out, like locusts, over the face of the land. . . . The countries of Asis-Phorni, Clardjeth, up to the shores of the sea, Chawcheth, Adchara, Samtzkhe, Karthli, Argoueth, Samokalako, and Dchqon-did were filled with Turks, who pillaged and enslaved all the inhabitants.

⁴⁰ *Maximi Monachi Planudis Epistulae*, ed. M. Treu (Amsterdam, 1960), 163.

⁴¹ Salimbene, ed. O. Holder-Egger, MGH, SS, XXXII (Leipzig/Hannover, 1905-13), 11.

⁴² Michael the Syrian, *Chronique*, ed. and trans. J. B. Chabot, III (Paris, 1905), 371.

⁴³ Wittek, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 13), 1-2; A. Philippson, *Reisen und Forschungen im westlichen Kleinasien*, IV: *Das östliche Lydien und südwestliche Phrygien* (Gotha, 1914), cf. map of the region of Laodiceia; X. de Planhol, "Le cadre géographique: Le pays de Laodicée-Denizli," in *Laodicée du Lycos. Le Nymphée. Campagnes 1961-63*, eds. J. des Gagniers, P. Devambez, L. Kahil, and R. Ginouvès (Paris, 1969), 394.

⁴⁴ F. Taeschner, *Al-'Umari's Bericht über Anatolien in seinem Werke Masâlik al-abşâr fî mamâlik al-amşar* (Leipzig, 1929), 21 ff.

In a single day they burned Kouthathis, Artanoudj, the hermitages of Clardjeth, and they remained in these lands until the first snows, devouring the land, massacring all those who had fled to the forests, to the rocks, to the caves....⁴⁵

The calamities of Christianity did not come to an end soon thereafter, for at the approach of spring, the Turks returned to carry out the same ravages and left [again] in the winter. The [inhabitants] however were unable to plant or to harvest. The land, [thus] delivered to slavery, had only animals of the forests and wild beasts for inhabitants. Karthli was in the grip of intolerable calamities such as one cannot compare to a single devastation or combination of evils of past times. The holy churches served as stables for their horses, the sanctuaries of the Lord served as repairs for their abominations [Islam]. Some of the priests were immolated during the Holy Communion itself, and others were carried off into harsh slavery without regard to their old age. The virgins were defiled, the youths circumcised, and the infants taken away. The conflagration, extending its ravages, consumed all the inhabited sites, the rivers, instead of water, flowed blood. I shall apply the sad words of Jeremiah, which he applied so well to such situations: "The honorable children of Zion, never put to the test by misfortunes, now voyaged as slaves on foreign roads. The streets of Zion now wept because there was no one [left] to celebrate the feasts. The tender mothers, in place of preparing with their hands the nourishment of the sons, were themselves nourished from the corpses of these dearly loved. Such and worse was the situation at that time...."⁴⁶

As Isaiah said: "...Your land is devastated, your cities reduced to ashes, and foreigners have devoured your provinces, which are sacked and ruined by barbarian nations."⁴⁷

By the time of the reign of David (1083–1125), the nomads had effected permanent settlement in these regions, moving into the abandoned and devastated areas with their tents, families, and flocks of livestock. They no longer departed at the onset of winter. Further, they quickly established the transhumant pattern of movement with flocks and families between a summer highland and a winter plain. By October, the month of vintage, they were settled in Gatchian on the banks of the Mtcouar, on the banks of the Ior, and in all the other regions where winter was milder. Here they found pasturage, forest, water, and various wild game for themselves and their countless horses, sheep, mules, and camels. In the spring they began to ascend the mountains of Somkheth and Ararat, where again they found the necessary pasturage and relief from the heat. But at no time did they cease to raid and devastate the adjoining territories of their Christian neighbors for booty and prisoners.⁴⁸

⁴⁵ M. Brosset, *Histoire de la Géorgie*, I (St. Petersburg, 1849), 346–47.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 348.

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, 349–50.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 358–59.

We see here described the full cycle of nomadic raid, conquest, and settlement. It begins with the seasonal raids of spring and summer, followed by withdrawal at the onset of the winter snows which made existence for the nomads and their flocks impossible. The raids are renewed annually at the onset of the vernal season until the invaded region is depopulated through flight, death, or enslavement, and agriculture comes to a halt. Then the cities, isolated from their agricultural hinterland, eventually fall also. With the flight of the agricultural population the nomads occupy the land, which is turned over to their flocks; thus a complete social entity, a nomadic society, is interposed. The situation depends on whether the host society is sufficiently strong militarily either to contain this foreign body and restrict its spread or else to remove it altogether. If there is no strong central authority, the nomadic core is free to spread until an equilibrium between land and nourishment on the one hand is sufficient for the number of men, livestock, and the acquisitive hunger of the pastoral group on the other. That which pushed this dynamic forward was the nature of this type of nomadism. The very process by which the agricultural society was eroded strengthened and enriched the nomads and stimulated them to further expansion. Thus, we are witnessing the timeless struggle of farmer and herdsman, the sown and the desert.

This process, described in great detail for northeastern Asia Minor and Georgia, was repeated in parts of northern, in southern (where Bertrandon de la Broquière depicted its results so graphically in the first half of the fifteenth century), and in western Anatolia.⁴⁹ For this latter area, where the Byzantine emperors struggled against nomadic encroachment, we have a considerable amount of detailed information. I shall give a few examples to illustrate the process and its effect on Byzantine civilization in western Asia Minor where the development of Byzantine civilization had been so intense.

As we saw from the earlier account of events, the regions between the Sangarius and the Bathys-Tembris Rivers were prime areas of Turkmen raids and settlement. Indeed, as late as the reign of Manuel Comnenus the important towns of Pithecas, Malagina, and Dorylaeum were still in ruins, and the Emperor finally rebuilt them as outposts against the unceasing nomadic incursions and depredations.⁵⁰ Particularly instructive was the situation of Dorylaeum in 1175, when Manuel rebuilt and colonized the city. Cinnamus gives the following description:

There was a time when this Dorylaeum was one of the great cities of Asia and very noteworthy. A gentle breeze blows upon the land, and it has about it very extensive level plains of extraordinary beauty [which are] so rich and fertile that they give forth rich grass and supply rich ears of grain. A river sends its stream through it and it is beautiful to see and sweet to taste. There is such a quantity of fish swimming in it, that no matter how much those fishing take, fish are never lacking. Here, formerly,

⁴⁹ C. Schefer, *Le voyage d'outremer de Bertrandon de la Broquière* (Paris, 1892), *passim*.

⁵⁰ Vryonis, *op. cit.*, 166: the catalogue of destroyed towns.

splendid mansions were built by the Caesar Melissenus, the villages were populous, and [there were] natural hot springs, stoas and baths, and all such things as bring pleasure to men. These things did the land provide in abundance. But the Persians [Turks], when the invasion of the land of the Rhomaioi was at its height, had razed the city to the ground and made it completely destitute of people, and they obliterated everything in it, even the thin trace of its former dignity. It was such a city. Then about 2,000 Persian [Turkish] nomads were encamped about it in tents as is their custom.⁵¹

Nicetas adds a very small but fascinating detail.

The Turks were upset [at the prospect of] retreating from the plains of Dorylaeum, in which their herds of cattle and goats passed the summer romping in the grassy meadows.⁵²

This was obviously an important base in their winter-summer transhumance. Such was the extent of nomad settlement in this area that the toponymy of the immediate area was markedly affected into modern times: immediately to the south of Dorylaeum rises a mountain 1566 m. in altitude, which is still known as Turkmen Dag, the nomad mountain. A few kilometers to the east was the important Turkmen religious shrine of Seyit Ghazi (1130 m.) and next to it was Kirgiz Dag (1301 m.). The southern slopes of Turkmen Dag, as late as the nineteenth century, carried the place names of Bajat and Düğer, and the north-west slope the name Kargin.⁵³ All three of these place names are probably quite old, and designate three Seljuk sub-tribal groups. Turkmen Dag, undoubtedly occupied by the Turkmens early in the conquest, separated the two key Byzantine centers of Dorylaeum and Cotyaeum, and thus from this mountain the nomads were able to raid and harass at will. To return to Manuel's rebuilding of Dorylaeum, the nomads began to gather and to attack Manuel's army, harassing the Byzantines when they foraged for food and timber. After it became obvious to the nomads that they could not halt the rebuilding of the city, they scorched the earth, burned their tents, and withdrew. This is, in short, a classic moment in, and example of, the struggle between sedentary and nomadic societies. We see the struggle for the land, and the resistance of the nomads who had destroyed Dorylaeum and its environs for over a century and had turned it into a habitation for their flocks of animals. Finally, and crucially, we see an instance of the temporary victory of the centralized power in reclaiming the desert for a sedentary society.⁵⁴

Manuel faced the same problem in southwestern Phrygia which was thoroughly nomadized by the time of his reign. Passage through the districts of

⁵¹ Cinnamus, 294–95.

⁵² Nicetas Choniates, 228.

⁵³ Philippson, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 43), III: *Die östliche Mysien und die benachbarten Teile von Phrygien und Bithynien* (Gotha, 1913), for the relevant map.

⁵⁴ Euthymius Malaces, ed. C. Bones. Εὐθυμίου τοῦ Μαλάκη, μητροπολίτου Νέων Πατρῶν (Ῥώμης), δύο ἐγκωμιαστικοὶ λόγοι, νῦν τὸ πρῶτον ἐκδιδόμενοι, εἰς τὸν αὐτοκράτορα Μανουὴλ Α' Κομνηνὸν (1143/80), in *Θεολογία*, 19 (1941–48), 526.

Lacerium, Panasium, Charax, and the Phrygian Pentapolis was difficult because of this heavy nomadization. The local populace had fled and scattered, towns had been destroyed and abandoned, and there was no focal point at which the Byzantines could center their own activities, protect their passing armies, and provision them. Consequently, Manuel decided to rebuild Choma-Soub-laum, near the sources of the Maeander. The Byzantines then rebuilt this long destroyed and abandoned city "in the midst of the Persian land," as the text says. Again the nomads resisted and tried to thwart the rebuilding, fearing the reassertion of control by a centralized government from a rebuilt, refortified, and recolonized city. Upon retreating, after their failure to halt the work of reconstruction, they once more scorched the earth and burned their tents. Henceforth Dorylaeum, Pithecas, Malagina, and Choma-Soub-laum became the bastions of Byzantium in the midst of the nomads.⁵⁵ After the battle of Myriocephalum, the Seljuk sultan made strenuous efforts to force Manuel to dismantle these two fortified areas, realizing full well what their existence meant for the Turkmens of the borders.

This struggle between sedentary and nomad peoples did not restrict itself to the border areas but spilled out into the heart of many of the maritime districts in the eleventh-twelfth centuries, and was intensified there in the late thirteenth and very early fourteenth centuries. The fate of the region of Adramyttium is again illustrative of the great chaos which the nomadic invasions caused. When the first wave of nomadic conquest and occupation had receded from western Anatolia before the combined attacks of the Crusaders and Alexius Comnenus, the cities of Adramyttium, Achyraous, and Lopadium to the north were in ruins. Anna Comnena relates in regard to the first: "It was formerly a most populous city. At that time when Tzachas was plundering the regions of Smyrna, destroying, he also obliterated it [Adramyttium]. The sight of the obliteration of such a city [was such] that it seemed that man never dwelled in it."⁵⁶

The nomadic depredations continued through the reigns of John and Manuel with the result that substantial rural districts were abandoned by their inhabitants, and agricultural production was halted completely. In the second half of the twelfth century, the rural districts of Adramyttium, Chliara, and Pergamum were still uninhabited despite the fact that they were well within the boundaries of the Byzantine Empire. Inasmuch as the nomadic raiders did not recognize firm boundaries, they had largely depopulated these fertile areas. It was not until Manuel built a series of rural fortifications that the area knew security, people returned to the land, agricultural production began again after several decades of disruption, and the area once more yielded handsome taxes to the imperial treasury in Constantinople.⁵⁷

⁵⁵ Nicetas Choniates, 227–28; Cinnamus, 298; Theodore Scutariotes (*supra*, note 21), 283; Euthymius Malaces, 546–47.

⁵⁶ Anna Comnena (*supra*, note 19), III, 143.

⁵⁷ Nicetas Choniates, 194–95. This work of refortification as evidenced in the sources has been confirmed by the preliminary archaeological investigations of W. Müller-Wiener, "Mittelalterliche Befestigungen im südlichen Jonien," *IstMitt*, 11 (1961), 29–36.

Finally, one more example from another riverine region at the time of the final nomadic push of the late thirteenth-fourteenth century will suffice to demonstrate the effect on the local society. Pachymeres writes of the Maeander districts: "Whence the Maeander was emptied not only of people in most of the extensive lands, but also of the very monks. For the land about the Maeander was another Palestine. It was very good not only for the increase of flocks and herds of animals, and for nourishing men, but excellent for assembling earthdwelling, heavenly citizen-monks. . . . And thus after a little the Maeander regions became desolate as the inhabitants withdrew deeper because of the attacks of the foreigners."⁵⁸ The Maeander valley had, of course, been a primary corridor of struggle between the Turkmens and Greeks throughout the twelfth century, but the foundation of the Nicaean state had halted the Turkmen push until the late thirteenth century.

By the early fourteenth century, the rural areas had all fallen and only isolated fortified cities had survived the nomadic settlement. The populace of the rural areas often fled to the cities or to the nearby isles and Constantinople. Pachymeres continues: "You saw at that time a pitiful sight, namely those who were carrying away their possessions and crossing over to the city [Constantinople], who had despaired of their salvation. And the straits received a throng of people and animals daily who had not been freed without the greatest tragedies. There was no one who did not lament the privation of the members of his family, one recalling her husband, another her son or daughter, another a brother and sister, and another some name of a relative."⁵⁹

The characteristics and impact of a continuing, repeated nomadic conquest and settlement are obvious. They had a partially destructive and very disruptive effect on Byzantine society.⁶⁰ The initial brunt was borne by the village populations which lay exposed and undefended before the nomadic warrior-herders. Consequently, many rural areas were abandoned before the pressure of the nomads and their flocks, a fact attested by the heavy Turkish influence on the rural toponymy of the area concerning us here.⁶¹ The degree of insecurity of the farming population in the nomadic belt stretching from the Sangarius to Antalya was substantial. One Latin author who visited Anatolia in the thirteenth century recorded that: "Those Greeks thus fear the Turkmens so that they do not dare to go out from their cities or castles if they do not take with them a bridled [horse] to which they are bound. For they assert that the Turkmens will kill him straightway if he does not take with him, prepared, the bridled [animal] to which he is bound. And on that account when they go out to sow or for wood or for whatever work, each one brings his bridled horse, to which he is tied."⁶² This insecurity of the farmer in the Trebizondine rural

⁵⁸ Pachymeres, I, 310-11.

⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, II, 335.

⁶⁰ Vryonis, *op. cit.*, 166.

⁶¹ W. Ramsay, *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia. Being an Essay of the Local History of Phrygia from the Earliest Times to the Turkish Conquest* (Oxford, 1895-97), *passim*.

⁶² Ricoldus de Monte Crucis, *Liber peregrinationis*, ed. J. C. M. Laurent, *Peregrinatores medii aevi quatuor* (Leipzig, 2nd ed., 1873), 114; Vryonis, *op. cit.*, 282.

areas is confirmed by the monastic documents of Vazelon, which list villagers carried away by the Turks.⁶³

As late as 1333, when the conquest of western Asia Minor was largely over and some of the Turkmen chieftains had become sedentary princes, many of their followers remained nomads, and Ibn Battuta, the Arab traveler, was struck by this fact during his voyage in Anatolia. He, as well as al-Umari, still referred to them as Turkmen,⁶⁴ and he had ample opportunity to see them and to note their disruptiveness during his travels in western Asia Minor. When he left from the lake districts of Eğirdir and Burdur via the road to Karagaç (Acıpayan, 45 km. south and southeast of Denizli), he had to pass through a plain inhabited by Turkmen. The prince of Ladik (Denizli) sent troops of cavalry to lead him and his party safely to Ladik and to protect them from the Turkmen bandits who infested the roads in that region.⁶⁵ Ibn Battuta tells his readers the reasons for extending his stay in Ladik once he had arrived there: "We remained for some time in that city because of the danger on the roads. When, however, a caravan was being prepared we traveled with it for a day and part of the following night until we arrived at the fortress of Davas. . . . We passed the night outside of its walls and approached the gate in the morning. The inhabitants of the fort interrogated us, high on the walls, on our arrival and we satisfied their questions. Then the commander of the castle, Ilias beg, came out at the head of his troops in order to reconnoiter the environs of the fortress and the road out of fear that the bandits might attack the flocks. When these men had made the circuit the flocks came out [of the castle]. And it is thus that they always act."⁶⁶ At a later point in his journey he passed through Izmir, mostly in ruins he says, and once he passed Magnesium and Sipylum his party arrived in the area of hostile nomadic encampments. Here they were not given any fodder for their animals, and during the night the nomads robbed them. They then made their way to Pergamum, a city also in ruins.⁶⁷

Obviously nomadism was still uncontrolled, and the nomads posed for the Turkish princes in their towns the same problems that these cities had experienced prior to the Turkmen conquests. The lack of security around Ladik and the town of Davas, the refusal of the commandant to open the gates to Ibn Battuta at night, and the necessity to reconnoiter the neighborhood before driving out the livestock to pasturage confirm what the Greek sources say about the effect of nomadism. In the twelfth century, many of the Byzantine towns which had survived the nomadic penetration became centers of Byzantine administration and Christianity isolated in a sea of nomads. Such was Laodiceia, which in order to survive had to undergo a *synoikismos*. Its scat-

⁶³ F. Uspenskij and V. Benešević, *Vazelonskie Akty* (Leningrad, 1927), 7, 17, 39, 40, 57-58, 76, 78.

⁶⁴ Ibn Battuta, trans. H. A. R. Gibb, *The Travels of Ibn Baṭṭūṭa A.D. 1325-1354*, II (Cambridge, 1962), 415, 417, 419; *Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah*, ed. and trans. C. Defremery and B. R. Sanguinetti (Paris, 1969), II, 257.

⁶⁵ Ibn Battuta, eds. Defremery and Sanguinetti, II, 270-71.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, II, 277-78.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 314-15.

tered suburbs were condensed into a centralized area and then walled. The city of Chonae, 25 km. to the east, became a similar isolated Byzantine center, surrounded by nomads with whom it reached, to varying degrees, a symbiotic relationship.⁶⁸ The area remained for centuries an area of nomadism, as the toponymy testifies. The plain of Chonae was known as Türkmenova, and the nomads moved seasonally between this plain and Honas Dag, across from Naldöken Dag. Other toponyms bearing testimony to nomads include Türkmenoglu, Bajat, Yürük Köy, Akkoyunlu, Mentesh, Cepni, Bayindir, and Düver (Düger).⁶⁹ On the other hand, the powerful threat of the nomads to the south completely isolated Attaleia, as a twelfth-century author reports: "It [Attaleia] possesses very rich fields, which are, nevertheless, of no advantage to the townspeople, for they are surrounded by enemies on all sides who hinder their cultivation. Therefore, the fertile soil lies fallow, since there is no one to work it. . . . The grain supply is brought from overseas."⁷⁰ When the second Crusaders complained about the paucity of supplies furnished them by the Greeks, the latter pointed to the abandoned and wasted lands outside the walls.

To come back to the impact and overall effect of the nomadic settlement of western Asia Minor, we have seen that it was an ethnic migration which brought with it a differing way of life and partial destruction and disruption of the local society, particularly in the rural areas, and which provided the basis for the Turkification of the area. Recent studies have shown in detail the numbers of towns and villages which were destroyed, some permanently, others temporarily, and a number repeatedly. Obviously this condition began to change after the mid-fourteenth century when the Turkish princes became sedentary rulers and began the rebuilding of the society. But the effect on Byzantine civilization and society was a severe shock from which they never recovered.

Up to this point the discussion has focused upon the development of nomadism and the effect of nomadic institutions upon a significant portion of Byzantine society in western Asia Minor. It is of equal importance to consider the impact of sultanic or Islamic institutions upon Byzantine civilization in Asia Minor, and specifically to examine their effect in terms of Islamization. One begins with the indisputable fact that in the eleventh century (prior to the Turkish invasions) the Anatolian populace was, overwhelmingly, Christian. It consisted primarily of Greeks, Armenians, Georgians, and Syrians, of whom the most numerous were the Greek-speaking Christians, and it is primarily with these that we are concerned here. A glance at the *notitia episcopatum* records the following data: in the eleventh century in Anatolia there were 47 metropolitanates and more than 400 bishoprics that were subservient to the Constantinopolitan patriarch.⁷¹ A *notitia* of the fifteenth century records that

⁶⁸ S. Lambros, *Ἀκομινάτου τοῦ Χωνιάτου τα σωζόμενα* (Athens, 1879), I, 56.

⁶⁹ Philippson, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 43), consult the relevant map.

⁷⁰ William of Tyre, *A History of Deeds Done Beyond the Sea*, ed. and trans. Emily A. Babcock and A. C. Krey (New York, 1943), Book XVI, Chap. 26: vol. II, p. 178.

⁷¹ Vryonis, *op. cit.*, 302-5, for further references.

of this large number of hierarchical seats in Anatolia there remained 17 metropolitanates, one archbishopric, and three bishoprics, whereas an ecclesiastical document of the seventeenth century relates the fact that 430 bishoprics had disappeared from Anatolia in the past. The official ecclesiastical documents are confirmed by the Ottoman registers of the early sixteenth century. Of 1,032,425 taxable hearths, 953,967 were Muslim, 77,869 were Christian, and 559 were Jewish, that is to say 92.4 percent Muslim, 7.5 percent Christian, and 0.1 percent Jewish.⁷² When one considers the basic facts of the religious affiliation of the inhabitants of Anatolia in the eleventh century and then in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the impression of a profound historical-cultural transformation is inescapable, as an ecclesiastical author of the fifteenth century recorded:

What a frightful decline! Read all [of the following] and you shall greatly lament.

There were also other metropolitanates, archbishoprics, and bishoprics as appears written in the diatyposis of the emperor lord Leo the Wise, and in that of the emperor lord Andronicus the second, of the Palaeologoi. . . . Of these, many were made desolate and were completely obliterated by those who rule us.

And neither is a metropolitan to be found in the metropolitanates, nor an archbishop in the archbishoprics, nor a bishop in the bishoprics, nor priest in church, nor monk in monastery or pious foundation or cell, nor other Christian layman in a castle or land. . . .

Fifty-one metropolitanates, eighteen archbishoprics, and four hundred and seventy-eight bishoprics are desolate. In the diatyposis of the said emperor lord Leo the Wise are ninety metropolitanates. . . .

And not only were those metropolitanates, archbishoprics, bishoprics, the monasteries and churches obliterated; But also the provinces of the three patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem. Neither will you find a single metropolitan there, nor other Christian, layman or clergy.

But on the thrones of those patriarchates you will find barely a few priests, monks, and laymen. Because the churches of their provinces have been obliterated completely and Christ's people, that is the Christians, have been utterly destroyed.⁷³

There remains the problem of explaining what happened during the centuries interspersed between the *notitia* of the eleventh century on the one hand and the fifteenth-century *notitia* and Ottoman tax registers on the other. It is very difficult to determine the proportion between the indigenous population at the time of the first Turkish invasions and the number of invaders who eventually settled on the land. At very best it is possible to make some very rough and very general estimates on the basis of broad categories of evidence.

⁷² Ö. L. Barkan, "Essai sur les données statistiques des registres de recensement dans l'Empire Ottoman aux XV^e et XVI^e siècles," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient*, 1 (1957), 20.

⁷³ Vryonis, *op. cit.*, 307.

First, there is the fact that the majority of the early invaders and settlers seems to have been nomadic. Not only did many of the towns remain predominantly Christian, but when the sultans finally began to establish order from the mid-twelfth century onward, they sought to recolonize rural areas with large numbers of Christian farmers. They frequently abducted them in raiding expeditions from one another or from the Christian-held lands in western and southern Asia Minor. The Muslims were not yet themselves numerically sufficient to replenish the demographic gap which the invasions had caused. In addition, it would seem that the nomadic groups had not yet become sedentary in any sizable number. As for the indigenous Christian populations, there is considerable evidence that points to substantial diminution of their numbers as a consequence of flight, enslavement, massacre, famine, and drought. But as of the late twelfth and thirteenth centuries a variety of sources indicates that they still formed an important proportion, perhaps the majority, of the Anatolian populace.⁷⁴

If this be the case, then it follows that the majority of the Anatolian Christian populace was absorbed by the conquerors through the process of religious conversion. The reverse is also true, that a substantial proportion of the Muslims in sixteenth-century Anatolia was ultimately of Byzantine or mixed ancestry. Indeed, the twelfth-century canon lawyer Balsamon notes specifically that the process of Islamization was observable in his day. In explaining Canon eighty-one of St. Basil, which deals with renunciation of Christianity under duress, Balsamon relates that Islamization was widespread: "Some say that the contents of the present canon are at rest [not in use] because by the grace of God the faith has been firmly set in Orthodoxy, and the tyrants have, many years ago, been stoned by the engines of martyrdom. But today, once more, many are captured by the hands of the Agarenes, and being tortured some abjure the Orthodox faith and accept the godless faith of Muhammad. Others willingly throw themselves into the pit of unbelief. According to the present canon all these shall be healed after confession and fitting repentance."⁷⁵

When Ludolph of Suchem passed through Anatolia in the mid-fourteenth century he remarked that the Turks were in part made up of Christian renegades. In addition, we know that from the early twelfth century onward, there emerged a class of Graeco-Turks, the offspring of mixed parents, who formed a distinct category in the society, usually known as *mixovarvaroi*, *Turcopoli*, or *igdiş*, often bilingual, who were Muslim or Christian depending upon whose domains they inhabited.⁷⁶

The factors and atmosphere which were instrumental in the conversion of this Greek-speaking Orthodox population have been studied in detail elsewhere so that I may here give but brief attention to this background. There are first the negative factors which undermined the cultural foundations of

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 182–83, for the evidence.

⁷⁵ G. Rhalles and M. Potles, *Σύνταγμα τῶν θείων καὶ ἱερῶν κανόνων*, IV (Athens, 1854), 247.

⁷⁶ Vryonis, *op. cit.*, 228–29.

Byzantine civilization in Anatolia. The Turkish conquests, by their prolonged and disruptive character, destroyed first the Byzantine administrative structure and then that of the ecclesiastical institution. These two forces, the Byzantine State and the Church, gave firm tone to the formal aspects of Byzantine culture which, upon the removal of these forces, suffered disastrously.

Particularly crucial was the catastrophic decline of the Church occasioned by the Turkish conquests, for with the disappearance of the Byzantine state only the ecclesiastical institution remained as a force capable of maintaining certain elements in the formal culture of the Anatolian Greek-speakers. The invaders destroyed the Church as an effective socio-cultural institution by depriving it of most of its property and revenues, by taxing it, and by excluding the metropolitans and bishops from their seats for extended periods of time. With the virtual destruction of the episcopacy, which at best remained as a passive cultural instrument, the Anatolian Christians were deprived of effective Christian leadership and of their basic social and eleemosynary institutions. The Church no longer had the economic power to support education, hospitals, orphanages, monasteries, and the like on an extensive scale. The disappearance of the Byzantine state and the precipitous decline of the Church were accompanied by a basic alteration in the outlook of the Greeks, increasingly characterized by defeatism, despair, and a cultural weakness.

The positive forces and factors in this great cultural transformation are to be sought in the sultanic or Islamic institutions and in the favorable conditions which attended them as the institutions of a militant, victorious, and ruling group. The sultans and emirs, though ultimately of tribal origin, became rulers according to the traditional Islamic patterns; that is, they abandoned tribalism as the basis of society and assumed the traditional sedentary patterns. These they gradually implanted throughout most of Anatolia by the building of towns, palaces, mosques, madrassas, imarats, turbes, caravanserais, hospitals, and the like. In the process they utilized sedentary Arabs, Persians, and Turks from the Muslim world who began to move toward Anatolia, especially after the Mongol invasions. In addition, the local sedentary populations were incorporated into this newly forming Islamic society as *dhimmi*'s. Underlying this Islamic society, which emerged through the spread of the traditional Islamic institutions, is the economic factor as exemplified in the very rapid growth and development of *waqf*, the Islamic pious foundation. The foundation of a mosque, madrassa, caravansary, or of any other Islamic institution was grounded on the gift of lands, revenues, and serfs. Thus the extensive lands, revenues, and manpower of the Christians were appropriated and put in the hands of the corresponding Muslim institutions. Very often the churches themselves were converted into mosques, as was the case with the famous church of St. John at Ephesus, to give but one of many spectacular examples.⁷⁷ A brief

⁷⁷ M. Treu, *Matthaios Metropolit von Ephesos. Über sein Leben und seine Schriften* (Potsdam, 1901), 56; S. Kourousses, Μανουήλ Γαβαλάς εἶτα Ματθαῖος Μητροπολίτης Ἐφέσου (1271/72-1355/60). Α', Τὰ βιογραφικά (Athens, 1972), 179-80.

glimpse at the *waqf* documents will suffice to illustrate the importance of the *waqf* and of the Islamic foundations it supported. Djalal al-Din Karatay, a Seljuk emir of Greek origin, founded a magnificent caravansary 25 miles from Caesarea, a madrassa in Konya, and a *dar as-suleha* in Antalya. At the caravansary travelers could expect free lodging, baths, medical care, and fodder for their animals. In addition, each traveler, whether Muslim, Christian, or Jew, was entitled to an *okka* of meat and a jar of food each day gratis. The revenues which made all of this possible came primarily from the two Christian villages of Likandon and Sarahor, whose inhabitants were required to pay 20% of their produce to the *waqf*.⁷⁸ Of great interest also is the madrassa in Konya which the *gulam* Shams al-Din Altun-Aba founded and endowed in the thirteenth century. The *waqf* provided a special revenue for the conversion of non-Muslims; specifically it was to pay for instruction in the Koran and prayers, and for the ceremony of circumcision, as well as for food, new clothes, and shoes which were to be presented to the converts. It is significant that of the three villages from which much of the *waqf*'s revenues came two were Christian.⁷⁹

As the religion of a militarily victorious and politically dominant group, there can be no doubt that Islam enjoyed not only enormous economic rewards and political preferment but also enormous moral prestige. In Islamic society, non-Muslim religious groups were openly tolerated and there can be no doubt whatever that this was the case in Anatolia. But the position of the Greeks, Armenians, and Syrians was debased and they constituted what we would call today second-class citizens. Though the sultans most frequently observed a policy of formal toleration, conversionary zeal was a definite and marked phenomenon in this new and exuberant Anatolian Islam, particularly among dervishes and *achi*'s, but also among the ruling classes and society at large. We know from the accounts of Palamas, Manuel Palaeologus, and Matthew the metropolitan of Ephesus that religious debates were passionately and keenly pursued in Ankara, Ephesus, and Bithynia during the fourteenth century.⁸⁰

With this background of negative and positive factors it is much easier to comprehend the Islamization of the Greek Christians. The favored position of the conquerors and the regression of defeated societies is an old and familiar theme in Islamic history, one which caused Ibn Khaldun to formulate historical laws of a more comprehensive type: "The vanquished always want to imitate the victor in his distinctive mark[s], his occupation, and all his other conditions and customs.

"A nation that has been defeated and comes under the rule of another nation will quickly perish."⁸¹

⁷⁸ O. Turan, "Celaleddin Karatay, vakıfları ve vakfiyeleri," *Belleten*, 12 (1948), 17-68.

⁷⁹ *Idem*, "Şemseddin Altun-Aba, vakfiyesi ve hayatı," *ibid.*, 11 (1947), 201-7, 211.

⁸⁰ Treu, *op. cit.*, 57; Manuel II. Palaeologos. *Dialoge mit einem "Perser"*, ed. E. Trapp (Vienna, 1966); S. Lambros, 'Επιστολή ἥν ἐξ Ἀσίας αἰχμάλωτος ὢν, πρὸς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ἐκκλησίαν ἀπέστειλεν, in *Νέος Ἑλλ.*, 16 (1922), 3-21.

⁸¹ Ibn Khaldun, *The Muqaddimah. An Introduction to History*, trans. E. Rosenthal, I (London, 1958), 299.

"The dialects of the urban population follow the language of the nation or race that has control of [the cities in question] or has founded them."⁸² Ibn Khaldun clearly understood the negative factors in cultural change. An imperial author and a contemporary of Ibn Khaldun, Manuel Palaeologus realized that many of his countrymen were converting to Islam for more positive reasons. He writes: "They desire to find that for which they originally went over to the enemies of the faith, namely wealth, glory, and all those things which are pleasant in this life."⁸³

The Christian populace was increasingly integrated into the tempo and style of life of their Muslim neighbors via the traditional Islamic institutions. As *dhimmi*'s they had a legalized place in the society, and because of their numbers and special skills many were directly integrated into the political and economic life of Islamic society at several levels. At this initial stage of absorption, one observes Christians in the Islamic court, administration, and economic life who preserve their religious affiliation. Such were the emirs Gabras and Mavrozomes, and the two uncles of Izz al-Din Kaykaus II, all of whom played major roles either in the Seljuk army or court. The chancery had a special bureau of Greek scribes or "notaran," and the Seljuk armies had special contingents of indigenous Greek troops with their own officers and uniforms. We encounter Greek physicians and musicians in the sultan's service, as well as Greek tax collectors in the provinces. The Christians also played a significant role in the commercial, industrial, and agricultural life of Muslim Anatolia as merchants, as craftsmen with their own specialties, and as the agricultural inculcators of the Turks. This represents the first stage of absorption.⁸⁴

An examination of the conversionary process will reveal how members of various of these classes apostacized to Islam, the forces and motives which prompted them to do so, and the considerable variety in the process.

The conversionary process is observable at the very highest level of Byzantine society, an important phenomenon not only because as its leaders the aristocracy set the example for their inferiors, but also because they undoubtedly brought many of their retinue with them. John Comnenus, nephew of the Emperor John II Comnenus, deserted to the sultan at Konya, turned Muslim, and married the sultan's daughter; the same apostatic phenomenon was observed among Georgian and Armenian princes as well.⁸⁵ The most spectacular case of acculturation and then apostasy is to be seen in the Gabras family, originally magnates of the Trebizondine regions where they were preeminent in the armies. Theodore Gabras played an important role in the border warfare with the Danishmendids. He was taken captive in the district of Paipert-Erzerum by the Turkish Emir Ali, who attempted to convert to Islam his illustrious captive. Subsequent to his refusal to apostatize he underwent mar-

⁸² *Ibid.*, I, 300.

⁸³ S. Lambros, *Παλαιολόγεια καὶ Πελοποννησιακά*, III (Athens, 1926), 46.

⁸⁴ Vryonis, *op. cit.*, 229ff. for details, sources, and bibliography.

⁸⁵ Nicetas Choniates, 42-43, 48-49; Brosset, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 45), 331, 349; Michael the Syrian, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 42), III, 247; Matthew of Edessa, *Chronique de 952 à 1136*, trans. E. Dulaurier (Paris, 1858), 195-96.

tyrdom, and so became the first of the neo-martyrs that appear in Greek hagiolatry during the Turkish period. A branch of this family seems to have become established at the Seljuk court in Konya comparatively early, for we encounter members of the family in very high position there. Manuel Comnenus, on the occasion of one of his earlier Turkish campaigns, inflicted a defeat on the Turkish armies and among the slain foe was a certain Gabras of whom Cinnamus says: "There was a certain person in the army of the barbarians whose clan goes back to the Rhomaioi. Having been raised among the Persians [Turks] and having been promoted by some fortune he was in charge of a satrapy among them at that time."⁸⁶ Some years later, at the fateful battle of Myriocephalum (1176), it was another Gabras, again an official at the sultan's court, who arranged the terms of peace between the sultan and the emperor. This was, probably, Kilidj Arslan's *amir-i-hādhib*, Ihtiyar al-Din Hasan ibn Gabras. Choniates says of the encounter between Manuel and Gabras: "The sultan sends to the emperor Gabras who had been honored by him with the highest and greatest [offices]. . . . Gabras greets him with profound and barbaric honor and proskynesis."⁸⁷ The name of this official leaves no doubt that he had converted to Islam, for the name is Muslim and the *kunya* is Gabras, an indication that his father had no Muslim name. In his person we are at the crucial moment of cultural absorption, for he had converted to Islam, the result no doubt of long association by the family with government service under the sultans. The fate of Ihtiyar al-Din is of further interest in that it illustrates the special situation of converts at such high levels. During the civil strife that broke out between the sultan and his son, Ihtiyar al-Din was dismissed from service, and as he made his way to the plain of Kanyukh with his sons, retinue, and 200 horsemen the Turkmens killed him and his sons. Bar Hebraeus relates: "They hacked him limb from limb, and hung him on the points of spears, and carried him round about Sebasteia on the day of the Festival of the Cross."⁸⁸ Another example of conversion at the highest level and as a result of association with service to the sultan has to do with the famous Köse Mihal, a Greek magnate of Bithynia who during Osman's reign entered Ottoman service with his troops and played a crucial role in the Bithynian conquests. The details of his conversion are forthcoming in the chronicle of 'Âshuqpaşazâde who relates that Osman forced him to convert to Islam upon threat of burning his lands.⁸⁹

One of the most efficient and comprehensive methods by which Greeks were recruited for the armies and administration, and forcibly converted, was the *gulam* system. In this method of military and governmental recruitment, the neophytes were circumcised and given a Muslim education appropriate to their

⁸⁶ Cinnamus, 56.

⁸⁷ Nicetas Choniates, 245-46.

⁸⁸ Bar Hebraeus, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 24), I, 330. On the family, C. Cahen, "Une famille byzantine au service des Seldjuquides d'Asie Mineure," *Polychronion. Festschrift Franz Dölger zum 75. Geburtstag*, ed. P. Wirth (Heidelberg, 1966), 145-49; A. Bryer, "A Byzantine Family: The Gabrades, c. 979-c. 1653," *University of Birmingham Historical Journal*, XII,2 (1970), 164-87.

⁸⁹ F. Giese, *Die altosmanische Chronik des 'Âşîkpaşazâde* (Osnabrück, 1972), 24-25.

future station, with the result that next to the sultans themselves they came to be the most generous founders and patrons of Islamic foundations and architecture.⁹⁰ Beyond the substantial number of Greeks converted via the *gulam* system there are cases of individual bureaucrats and translators who, once in the service of the Muslims, converted. Ducas reports one such case, that of Michael Pylles: "This Pylles was from Ephesus, a Rhomaiois by race, a Christian by religion, was of the well-born of this city, [was] by vocation and craft a scribe in the palace of the sultan in Greek and Arabic letters, and in deed and manner [was] intractable, lustful, prodigal, profane. . . . Having fettered and tortured him unmercifully, for he was hated by all, they then kindled a fire and placed the miserable one in it asking him if he wished to renounce the faith of the Christians that he might be saved. If not, the fire should devour him. Then did he, already before his denial a Turk in his deeds, deny the [Christian] faith, and they circumcised him and paraded him."⁹¹ In this case, we see the combination of service in the administration of the court and forced conversion.

Up to this point the discussion has focused upon the conversion of isolated individuals and upon the milieu of the court, administration, and army. The Christians who found themselves in this official circle were subject to strong conversionary pressure. But what of those classes which were removed from the upper echelons of the social hierarchy?

This brings our discussion to one of the principal missionizing forces in the Muslim society of Anatolia, the dervishes. One may characterize these brotherhoods as latitudinarian in religious approach, and as emphasizing the emotional approach in bringing religion to the common man. In contrast to the legalist *ulama*, the dervishes played directly on the religious sensitivity by employing music, dance, poetry, and the vernacular tongues of both Greeks and Turks. The second characteristic feature of the orders was their compulsive missionary spirit. Jalal al-Din Rumi gave voice to this compelling spirit in the *Manaqib al-Arifin*: "... The first Cause . . . has brought us from Khurasan and sent us to Asia Minor . . . so that we might generously spread the philosophical stone of our mysteries over the copper of the existence of its inhabitants, in such a manner that we shall transform them alchemically, and they shall become confidants of the world of gnosis and companions of the mystics of the entire world. 'It is thus that he said: "You brought me from Khurasan to the land of the Greeks that I might mingle with them and lead them to the good doctrine. . . ."' "⁹²

From the thirteenth century the number of dervishes and *zawiyya*'s grew until they had penetrated most regions of the Anatolian peninsula. Kalandars, Rifais, and Kazarunis streamed into the region where their numbers were swelled even-

⁹⁰ S. Vryonis, "Seljuk Gulams and Ottoman Devshirmes," *Der Islam*, 41 (1965), 224-52.

⁹¹ Michael Ducas, *Istoria turco-bizantină*, ed. V. Grecu (Bucharest, 1958), 235. Another bilingual translator and convert was the Greek of Ankara who served as an interpreter in the theological debate between Manuel Palaeologus and the Ancyrene *muderris*; Manuel Palaeologos, *op. cit.* (*supra*, note 80), 79.

⁹² Eflaki, *Les saints des derviches tourneurs*, ed. and trans. Cl. Huart, I (Paris, 1918), 190.

tually by the foundation of the local Mawlawis and Bektashis.⁹³ Some of these orders, particularly the Kazarunis, had enjoyed a successful history of religious conversion before ever coming to Anatolia. Of these *tariqa*'s the most important in the conversion of the Byzantine Christians were the Bektashis and Mawlawis. The Bektashis, probably oriented toward rural society in the beginning, were successful in presenting a syncretism of Muslim and Christian elements at a sufficiently low level to make conversion attractive to rural Christians. The text of the semi-legendary Vilayatname tells us that Hadji Bektash sent four of his disciples to the Udj district in the west, precisely in that mountainous region where we saw the Turkmens so densely settled. Their appearance there coincides with the conquests of these lands by the Turkmen emirs in the late thirteenth to fourteenth century. Furthermore, the Bektashi tradition, probably embodying historical kernels for this critical period, relates that Sarī Ismail transformed the Christian church of Tavas into a mosque and converted its inhabitants to Islam. His fellow Bektashi, Rasul Baba, transformed both the church and the Christian inhabitants of Altıntaş.⁹⁴ The conquests of these regions, the conversionary activities of both Bektashis and Mawlawis, coincide with and are the causes of the drastic diminution of Christianity in these areas that we see reflected in the *notitia episcopatum*.

The other major order founded in Asia Minor, the Mawlawi, was oriented more toward the urban centers.⁹⁵ We have already noted Rumi's conviction that God had brought him to missionize, and this order, which traces its origin to him, made use of a lavish *sema*', that is, dance and music, in a mystical liturgy which eventually united the adept with God in that supreme love so dear to the soul of mystics. Rumi and his successors appealed to both the upper and lower classes. But, like Socrates, Rumi spent most of his time in the market place discoursing on mystical love with the merchants and craftsmen, where the tic-tac of the hammer of the goldsmith Salah al-Din Zerkub established the cadence of Rumi's ecstatic dance.⁹⁶ His followers, much to the shock of the upper classes, included merchants, butchers, bakers, tailors, carpenters, painters, goldsmiths, and prostitutes. After Rumi's death, his son Sultan Walad and grandson Amir Arif spread the order throughout the cities of Anatolia, including those of the west: Ladik, Tavas, Afyon Karahisar, Akshehir, Alaya, Antalya, Begshehir, Egridir, Kutahya, and Birgi. By this expansion, his missionary Sufism brought a mystical and popular Islam to the conquered Christians.

If we return to the lifetime and activity of Rumi in Konya, we clearly see that his contacts with the Konyiotes comprehended not only all social classes from sultan to lowly slave, but all the ethnic and religious groups: Muslim

⁹³ For the details which follow, Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, 351-402.

⁹⁴ E. Gross, *Das Vilayet-name des Haggi Bektash. Ein türkisches Derwischevangelium* (Leipzig, 1927), *passim*.

⁹⁵ See, above all, the extraordinary book of A. Gölpınarlı, *Mevlanadan sonra Mevlevilik* (Istanbul, 1953), and his article "Mevlevilik," in *İslâm Ansiklopedisi*, VIII (Istanbul, 1957), 164-71. For a detailed bibliography, see Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, 381-82.

⁹⁶ Eflaki, ed. Huart, I, 336-37; II, 198-99. For a miniature depicting this celebrated event, see the plates in Ş. Uzluk, *Mevlevilikte resim, resimde Mevleviler* (Ankara, 1957).

Persians, Arabs, and Turks, Greek and Armenian Christians, and even Jews. In particular, he and his followers had very close relations with the Christian monks of the area, a tradition that still lived in Konya until the First World War. Rumi and his adepts were wont to visit the Greek monastery of St. Chariton, or of Plato as they called it, in the vicinity of Konya where they were always hospitably received by the monks.⁹⁷ Some time after Rumi's death his grandson Arif and a number of the Mawlawis visited the monastery, and Eflaki (a contemporary and himself a Mawlawi) relates the incident:

"There was, in the monastery of Plato, a very old and wise monk. Every time that the companions made a promenade and came to this monastery he served them in every manner and manifested his confidence in them. He very much loved Chelebi Arif. One day the companions interrogated him on the cause of this confidence, on the opinion that he had of the Master, as well as on the manner by which he had come to know him. He replied, 'What do you others know of him? I, I have witnessed from him countless miracles and unlimited astonishing things; I became his sincere servant. I have read the biographies of past prophets in the Gospels, and I found the same thing in his blessed person, and I believed in his truth....'"⁹⁸

He goes on to relate that on one occasion when Rumi had come to spend a retreat of 40 days in the monastery, he had taken the opportunity to ask Rumi about a Koranic passage which says that "There is not any among you who will not enter the fires; this shall be, . . . an ordained decree." Immediately Rumi took the monk to a bakery near the outskirts of Konya and took off his *feredje* and the black silk garment of the monk, which he then placed in the lighted oven. After a period of time the baker retrieved the *feredje*, intact, which Rumi put on. The monk's cloth had been completely consumed, whereupon Rumi told the monk: "It is thus that we [Muslims] enter, while as for you it is thus that you enter." Immediately, says the monk, "I prostrated myself and became his disciple."⁹⁹

While it is true that the monk remained a Christian, it is obvious that he also became a disciple of the Mawlawis. Cases of such split religious personalities are known from other literary sources and correspond to the double sanctuaries, for both Christians and Muslims, that came to exist in Anatolia, and also to the equation of certain Muslim and Christian saints that appear in dervish religiosity (i.e., Charalamabos-Hadji Bektash, and George-Chidr).

A clear case of conversion within the milieu of Rumi and the dervishes has to do with a Greek of Konya, Thiryanus, an individual who came to play an important role in the order after his conversion. Thiryanus occupies a certain importance in the Manaqib al-Arifin, where Eflaki recounts his crime (murder), his arrest by the police, and Rumi's intervention. Rumi took the young Greek under his protection, and then surrounded by companions accompanied him

⁹⁷ F. W. Hasluck, *Christianity and Islam under the Sultans* (Oxford, 1929), II, 373-74; S. Eyice, "Konya ile Silile arasında Ak manastır, Menâkıb al-'Arifin' deki Deyr-i Eflatun," *Şarkıyat Mecmuası*, 6 (1966), 135-60.

⁹⁸ Eflaki, II, 67-68.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, II, 68.

to the ceremonial bath, after which Thiryanus underwent circumcision and turned Muslim. The ritual was succeeded by a mystical concert and the bestowal of a Muslim name upon Thiryanus: "'What is your name,' asked the master. 'Thiryanus,' replied the young man. 'Henceforth,' said Djalal al-Din Rumi, 'you shall be called 'Ala' al-Din Thiryanus.''"¹⁰⁰

The story has been reduced to its barest essentials: the occasion on which the convert was subject to the convenience of conversion (the alternative would have been execution); his ablutions, circumcision, and profession of Islam; the dervish ritual; and finally the adoption of a Muslim name. These were the standard steps in the departure from the Christian community and entrance to the Muslim congregation. Usually the process was accompanied by celebrations, music, and parades.¹⁰¹

Eflaki tells us that the Islamization of the Greek painter 'Ayn al-Dawla Rumi was the result of intellectual persuasion rather than of the force of ominous circumstances:

Kalo-Yani the painter and 'Ayn al-Dawla Rumi were two Greek painters who were beyond compare in this art and in that of representing figures. They became disciples of the Master. One day Kalo-Yani said: "In Constantinople a picture of . . . Jesus has been painted that is beyond compare. . . . The painters from throughout the world have gone there but have not been able to reproduce similar figures." 'Ayn al-Dawla, moved by an intense desire to see this painting, set out and for one year remained in the great monastery of Constantinople (where it was kept) in the service of the monks. One night, when he found a favorable opportunity, he took the painting under his arm and left. After arriving in Konya he went to visit the Master: "Where were you?" asked the latter. He told of the adventure of the painting. "Let us see this charming painting," said the Master. "It must be very beautiful and gracious." After having contemplated it for some time, he continued: "These two beautiful figures complain bitterly of you. They say: 'He is not proper in his love for us. He is a false lover.''" "How is that?" replied the painter. "They say: 'We never sleep or eat, we are awake at night and fast during the day, while 'Ayn al-Dawla has abandoned us. . . .'" "It is absolutely impossible," said the painter, "for them to sleep and eat. They are not able to speak, for they are figures without a soul." "You, who are a figure with a soul," replied the Master, "you who are so richly talented in the arts, you who have been created by a Creator whose work includes the universe, Adam, and everything on the earth and in the skies, are you allowed to abandon Him and to fall enamoured of a painting without soul and mind? What can result from these nonconscious figures? What profit can you derive from them?" Immediately the painter repented and . . . was converted to Islam.¹⁰²

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, I, 245.

¹⁰¹ J. Schiltberger, *Reisen des Johannes Schiltberger aus München in Europa, Asia und Africa von 1394 bis 1427*, ed. K. F. Neumann (Munich, 1859), 130–32; Bertrand de la Broquière (*supra*, note 49), 219.

¹⁰² Eflaki, II, 69–70.

This painter, as we are told in another passage, was patronized by the court and indeed had been commissioned by Gurdji Khatun, wife of the sultan, to paint a portrait of Rumi. Of the two painters, only 'Ayn al-Dawla converted to Islam, undoubtedly because of economic and social factors, whereas the other painter, Kalo Yani, remained a disciple of Rumi without undergoing conversion. Again we see the two steps of religious absorption represented by the status of these two painters.

Other Greek craftsmen, with economic advantages accruing to them via their association with the circle of Rumi, also converted, and here one notes in particular architects and builders: "One day . . . a Greek architect constructed a chimney in the house of the Master. The friends, by way of joking, said to him: 'Since Islam is the best religion, why do you not become a Muslim . . . ?' He replied: 'I have been a follower of Christ for fifty years. I fear Him and would be ashamed to abandon His religion.' The Master suddenly entered and spoke: 'The mystery of faith is fear. Whosoever fears God, even though he be a Christian, is religious not irreligious.' After having pronounced these words, he disappeared. The Christian architect was converted, and became a disciple and sincere friend as well."¹⁰³

Other examples of conversion include episodes involving the monks of other areas, rabbis, and people of the streets. But certainly the most spectacular testimony to the effect of Rumi's personality, mysticism, and missionizing in Konya is the description of his funeral:

After they had placed his body on the litter, all the great and humble uncovered their heads . . . and raised such a tumult that it resembled that of the great resurrection. All wept, and most of the men marched in the procession, uttering cries and tearing their clothes The members of the different communities and nations were present, Christians, Jews, Greeks, Arabs, Turks, etc. They marched forward, each holding on high their sacred scriptures. In accord with their customs, they read verses from the Psalms, the Pentateuch, and Gospels and uttered funeral lamentations. The Muslims were not able to restrain them either by blows from clubs or from swords There arose an immense disturbance, the news of which reached the sultan . . . and his minister. [Accordingly] they summoned the chiefs of the monks and priests and demanded what possible connection this event could have with them, since the sovereign of religion [Rumi] was the director and imam of the Muslims. They replied: "In seeing him we have comprehended the true nature of Christ, of Moses, and of all the prophets . . . such as we have read about in our books. If you Muslims say that our Master [Rumi] is the Muhammad of his period, we recognize him similarly as the Moses and Jesus of our times. Just as you are his sincere friends, we also are one thousand times over his servants and disciples. It is thus that he said:

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, II, 2-3

"Seventy-two sects hear from us their own mysteries. We are as a flute which, in a single mode, is in tune with 200 religions."

"Our Master is the sun of truth which has shone upon mortals and accorded them favor; all the world loves the sun which lights their abodes." Another Greek priest said: "Our Master is much like unto bread which is indispensable to all the world. Has a hungry man ever been seen to flee from bread?"¹⁰⁴

The examples of Eflaki illustrate conversions both of individuals and of larger groups (as at the funeral), whereas the early Ottoman sources record that the conquest of Bithynia was accompanied by mass apostasy in the districts of Yalova, Taraklı-Yenidjesi, Goynuk, and Modreni, during the reign of Orhan.¹⁰⁵

Less well documented, but possibly widespread at this time, was the incomplete conversion induced by fear and which is usually called Crypto-Christianity. It is in evidence in Nicaea within two decades of the Ottoman conquest of that city, as we learn from a patriarchal letter of about 1338:

Since the attack of the Ismaelites prevailed over us by God's permission as a result of the multitude of our sins, they have captured and enslaved many of our own and violently forced them and dragged them along, alas, so that they took up their evil and godlessness; and to those having fallen into such a depth of evil occurred a realization [that] they were evil and [this] aroused them to seek the ways of the Christians again. But another thought came to them, and they hesitate and wish to learn for certain whether they will not fail utterly or shall achieve their salvation. The church of God pledges itself to all such and gives definite information; that it [the church] will heal and cure and number among the side of the Christians again those taking up the true belief in God and [those] removing [themselves] from the evil of the Muslims into which they fell. Nor shall they find any obstacle to the salvation of their own souls because of the failure, as it is said, which occurred to them. But as many of these who will show their repentance openly and freely so that they choose to suffer for the faith in God, these will bind on the crown of martyrdom (an exact proof of this is the great martyr of Christ, Jacob the Persian). As many as wish to live in secret, practicing and keeping in their heart the Christian way, because of the fear of punishments against them, these also shall attain salvation. Only, they shall try as much as possible to keep the commands of God. And this present letter of the church of God became an assurance concerning this.¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 96-97.

¹⁰⁵ F. Giese, *Die altosmanischen anonymen Chroniken in Text und Übersetzung herausgegeben*, II (Leipzig, 1925), 18-19, 23.

¹⁰⁶ F. Miklosich and J. Müller, *Acta et diplomata graeca medii aevi sacra et profana*, I (Vienna, 1860), 183-84.

The crypto-religious phenomenon is, of course, a generic phenomenon known in many other cultural areas, and was still in evidence in nineteenth-century Anatolia.

At the other extreme of the course of peaceful conversion, which we saw in evidence when discussing the Mawlawi dervishes, is the case of the neo-martyr Nicetas the Young, who was martyred for the faith between 1282–1304 or 1307–8. He and two other Greek merchants set out from Ankara to Nyssa, where they arrived during the Muslim fast of Ramadan. Having outraged Muslim religious sensitivities by taking their meal inside the city of Nyssa during the Muslim fast, they were brought before the Muslim governor and the *cadi*. During the interrogation, which degenerated into a debate between Christianity and Islam, the three merchants were beaten and condemned to death by the judge. Marched off to the site where they were to be burned alive, they were attacked by the mob, at which point two of the terrorized merchants apostacized to save their lives. Nicetas persevered to the end, proclaiming his Christianity and anathematizing Islam. He was hung by the feet and roasted over the burning embers.¹⁰⁷

These examples will suffice to illustrate the rich variety in the conversionary process. Vertically, the process reached every social class; horizontally, it spread over all the rural and urban areas of Asia Minor from Ephesus to Edessa and from Trebizond to Tarsus. The motives and factors for apostasy involved economic advantage, religious conviction, social mobility, fear and duress, cultural weakness, even aesthetics and hedonism. Ibn Khaldun realized all of this when he stated: "The common people follow the religion of the Ruler."¹⁰⁸

There can be no doubt that the discrepancy between the eleventh and fifteenth centuries in the numbers of Anatolian Christians is largely due to the conversionary process, which operated at every social, ethnic, and religious level of the Christian population, and which was the result of the institutions and conditions created by the Islamic states of the area. Incidental sources mention conversion in sixty-one Anatolian towns at various periods.¹⁰⁹

Whereas the nomadic conquests and settlements produced a state of disruption and disequilibrium in substantial areas formerly inhabited by the Greek Christians, the sultans brought a stable Muslim society which absorbed the disoriented Christians.

The Manaḳib al-Arifin ascribes to Rumi an anecdote which describes the great cultural metamorphosis of Anatolia with almost classical simplicity and clarity and with which I shall close. The text begins:

There is a well known story that the sheikh Salah al-Din one day hired some Turkish workmen to build the walls of his garden. "Effendi Salah al-Din, said the Master [Rumi], you must hire Greek workmen for

¹⁰⁷ H. Delehayé, "Le martyre de Saint Nicétas le Jeune," *Mélanges offerts à M. Gustave Schlumberger* (Paris, 1924), I, 205–11.

¹⁰⁸ Ibn Khaldun (*supra*, note 81), I, 300.

¹⁰⁹ Vryonis, *The Decline of Medieval Hellenism*, 394 and *passim*.

this construction. It is for the work of demolition that Turkish workmen must be hired. For the construction of the world is special to the Greeks, and the demolition of this same world is reserved to the Turks. When God created the universe, he first made the carefree infidels. He gave them a long life and considerable force in such a fashion...that in the manner of paid workmen they constructed the earthly world. They erected numerous cities and mountain fortresses...so that after centuries these constructions serve as models to the men of recent times. But divine predestination has disposed of affairs in such a way that little by little the constructions become ruins. He created the people of the Turks in order to demolish, without respect or pity, all the constructions which they see. They have done this and are still doing it. They shall continue to do it day in and day out until the day of the Resurrection."¹¹⁰

This Muslim anecdote is quite symbolic. The Greek workmen represent the Christian society of Asia Minor; the Turkish workmen symbolize the Turkmen nomads who caused such destruction and displacement to the Christian sedentary society. It was Jalal al-Din and his followers, as well as other representatives of Muslim or sultanic institutions, who played such an important role in successfully rebuilding the ruined Anatolian world on the models of Islamic society.

University of California, Los Angeles

¹¹⁰ Eflaki, II, 208-9.